

Appln. No. 10/685,687  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of 02/23/06

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 remain pending in this application and stand rejected. Claim 1 is amended to recite, in part, "applying a pellicle as a film bearing a dielectric mirror layer to the adhesive layer such that the dielectric mirror layer is substantially optically smooth against the electro-optic sensor material". The amendment to claim 1 clarifies the claim's language.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holman et al. (US 6831769) in view of Bryan (US 6151153), Zuchowski (US 6483643) and further in view of Haas et al. (US 5153759). Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holman et al., Bryan, Zuchowski, Haas, and further in view of Sadovink et al. (US 5764317). Claim 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holman et al., Bryan, Zuchowski and also Haas, and further in view of Nakamura et al. (US 6346164). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons that follow. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserts:

...note Holman teachings coating the sensor material directly onto the electrode-column 12, lines 41-42 and 60-62; column 3, lines 6-36), applying a thin layer of adhesive 180 over the layer of electro-optic sensor material (note reference teachings coating the adhesive directly onto the sensor material-column 13, lines 9-20), and laminating a film (not shown in Figures- Holman refers to this film as a 'backplane') to the adhesive layer such that the film is substantially optically smooth against the sensor material (column 13, lines 24-27; column 4, lines 3-31). The reference is silent as to the transparent substrate being glass and the film being a pellicle film bearing a dielectric mirror layer.

As best understood from the excerpts of Holman cited by the Examiner, Holman is directed at laminating a front panel laminate to a backplane:

Appn. No. 10/685,687  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of 02/23/06

PATENT

The FPL 100 is desirably prepared by coating the lamination adhesive 180, in liquid form, conveniently by slot coating, on to release sheet 190, drying (or otherwise curing) the adhesive to form a solid layer and then laminating the adhesive and release sheet to the electro-optic layer 130, which has previously been coated on to the substrate 110 bearing the conductive layer 120; this lamination may conveniently be effected using hot roll lamination.

(Alternatively, but less desirably, the lamination adhesive may be applied over the electro-optic layer 130 and there dried or otherwise cured before being covered with the release sheet 190.) The release sheet 190 is conveniently a 7 mil (177  $\mu$ m) film; depending upon the nature of the electro-optic medium used, it may be desirable to coat this film with a release agent, for example a silicone. As illustrated in FIG. 1, the release sheet 190 is peeled or otherwise removed from the lamination adhesive 180 before the FPL 100 is laminated to a backplane (not shown) to form the final display. (13: 9-27)

In other words, Holman appears concerned with the lamination of a liquid crystal layer to a backplane of electrodes and other circuitry. Holman states that making a 3-layer electro-optic display involves at least one lamination operation (3:59-60). Holman's discussion focuses on the lamination adhesive that lies between the liquid crystal layer and the backplane. Holman further states that this combination then awaits the backplane, which is attached after removal of the release sheet (11:60-62; 12:14-16; 13:23-26):

As illustrated in FIG. 1, the release sheet 190 is peeled or otherwise removed from the lamination adhesive 180 before the FPL 100 is laminated to a backplane (not shown) to form the final display. (13: 9-27)

However, as pointed out correctly by the Examiner, there is no disclosure in Holman, of "a pellicle film bearing a dielectric mirror layer", as recited, in part, in claim 1". Holman thus fails to teach or suggest claim 1.

Appln. No. 10/685,687  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of 02/23/06

PATENT

As previously noted and acknowledged by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action, Bryan applies the sensor material to the electrode via a transfer substrate and therefore teaches away from the claimed invention.

Zuchowski is cited by the Examiner as:

...especially in light of the fact that it is known in the electro-optical sensor art to apply a mirror lamina M to an electro-sensor material F that has been applied to a substrates without using a transfer substrate, such as by coating, as taught by Zuchowski (Figure 8; column 5, lines 59-60; column 6, lines 30-34; column 8, lines 29-34; column 12, lines 11-4)

Applicants submit that Zuchowski is directed at viewing screens upon or through which images are projected:

This invention relates to viewing screens upon or through which images are projected, it being a general object of this invention to efficiently control and maximize light emission or "gain", especially from large screen areas. More particularly, it is an object here to provide a variable gain viewing screen for either rear or front projection, and a screen that can be implemented without restriction to size and shape. (1:5-12)

Zuchowski is not concerned with and is silent on fabricating electro-optical sensor. Zuchowski, for example, fails to teach or suggest "A method for fabricating an electro-optical sensor.... applying a composition of electro-optic sensor material as a layer over the transparent electrode without using a transfer substrate.... applying a pellicle as a film bearing a dielectric mirror layer to the adhesive layer such that the dielectric mirror layer is substantially optically smooth against the electro-optic sensor material", as recited, in part, in claim 1. Zuchowski thus fails to teach or suggest claim 1.

Appln. No. 10/685,687  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of 02/23/06

PATENT

Haas is directed at:

optically addressed light valve systems and more specifically to real-time reflective light valve systems and processes for using the light valves." (4:6-9)

Like Zuchowski, Haas is not concerned with and is silent on fabricating electro-optical sensor. Haas for example, fails to teach or suggest "A method for fabricating an electro-optical sensor.... applying a composition of electro-optic sensor material as a layer over the transparent electrode without using a transfer substrate..... applying a pellicle as a film bearing a dielectric mirror layer to the adhesive layer such that the dielectric mirror layer is substantially optically smooth against the electro-optic sensor material", as recited, in part, in claim 1.

Therefore, Claim 1 is allowable over Holman, in view of Bryan, Zuchowski and further in view of Haas. Claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as is claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all pending claims, namely claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (650) 752-2424.

Respectfully submitted,



Ardeshir Tabibi  
Reg. No. 48,750

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: (650) 326-2400  
Fax: (650) 326-2422  
AT:deh

60728573 v1